	Case 4:11-cv-00328-FRZ Document 17	Filed 04/18/14 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8	Decree at Coulds	
9	Raymond Smith,	N. CV 11 220 THC ED7 (DDV)
10	Petitioner,	No. CV-11-328-TUC-FRZ (BPV)
11 12	VS.	ORDER
13	Craig Apker,	OKDEK
14	Respondent.	
15	respondent.	
16	Before the Court for consideration is the	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28
17		
18		
19	The Petitioner was found to have committed the prohibited act of possession of narcotics	
20	paraphernalia, in violation of Federal Bureau of Prisons Program Statement 5270.08 Code 113. The	
21	DHO sanctioned Petitioner to a loss of 40 days good conduct time, 60 days of disciplinary	
22	segregation, 1 year loss of visits, 6 months immediate family only visits, and recommended a	
23	disciplinary transfer.	
24	The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus lists two grounds for relief: Ground One "U.D.C	
25	staff violated the rights of [P]etitioner in not securing a confidential hearing for the U.D.C.;" Ground	
26	Two "the 24-hour notice requirement was disregarded because the petitioner never received notice	
27	of appearance prior to the D.H.O. hearing."	
28	The Petitioner also raised a new ground for relief in his reply to the Respondent "that either	
	the failure of the D.H.O. to allow the requested staff witnesses to testify, instead of submitting	

written statements, or the failure of his requested staff representative to represent him instead of Case Manager Hammoude, would have cast doubt about his actual guilt in this instance, or would have assisted him in bringing the due process issue to the forefront in a way that he could not."

This matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Bernardo P. Velasco, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), Rule 72, Fed.R.Civ.P., and Local Rules 72.1 and 72.2 of the Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, for further proceedings and Report and Recommendation.

Magistrate Judge Velasco issued his Report and Recommendation, recommending the Court deny the Petition of Habeas Corpus. This recommendation is based on that the finding that: Ground One "fails as a matter of fact and a matter of law;" Ground Two "fails to raise a due process claim."

The Magistrate Judge further recommends that the new claim raised in the Petitioner's reply to the response be denied as "the Petitioner's claims that he was deprived of due process are without merit and fail to provide a basis for relief."

The Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Velasco sets forth the factual and procedural history of the Petitioner's Bureau of Prison disciplinary proceedings, sanctioning, and subsequent appeals at issue, as well as provides a thorough analysis of the claims and legal standards at issue.

The Petitioner filed an Objection to the Report and Recommendation that was issued by Magistrate judge Velasco pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), challenging the substantive and procedural findings set forth therein.

This Court finds, after consideration of all the matters presented and an independent review of the record which included the Objection to the Report and Recommendation by the Petitioner, that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus be denied and this action be dismissed in accordance with the Report and Recommendation set forth therein.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Velasco's Report and Recommendation [Doc. 14] is hereby ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED as the findings of fact and conclusions of law by this Court;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is DENIED and

## 

1	this action is hereby DISMISSED;
2	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that judgment be entered accordingly.
3	
4	DATED this 18th day of April, 2014.
5	
6	Fronk R Eurola
7	Frank R. Zapata Senior United States District Judge
8	Senior Chited States District dauge
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28